

## UNITED STATES PARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

Washington, D.C. 20231

DATE MAILED:

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVE	ENTOR	TTA	ORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/915,8	983 - J8721 <b>79</b> 7	FUJIR		247	Q3661Z-1
-		IM51/1907	<b>¬</b>	EX	AMINER
	BYLVANIA AVEN MION ZINN MAC		į i	ನಟ್ಕ⊩.√	71
WASHINGT	FON DO 2003 <b>7</b> -3	202	[	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			•	1.752	26

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or pr ceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks** 

10/07/99

**Advisory Action** 

Application No. 08/915,683 Applicant(s)

Fujita et al.

Examiner

Mark F. Huff

Group Art Unit 1752

1 [	HE RERIOD FOR RESPONSE: (check only a) or h)]
	HE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE: [check only a) or b)]  a) [X] expires 5 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
	<ul> <li>expires either three months from the mailing date of the final rejection, or on the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.</li> </ul>
	Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.
X	Appellant's Brief is due two months from the date of the Notice of Appeal filed on <u>Aug 5, 1998</u> (or within any period for response set forth above, whichever is later). See 37 CFR 1.191(d) and 37 CFR 1.192(a).
Ap bu	applicant's response to the final rejection, filed on <u>Sep 30, 1998</u> has been considered with the following effect, ut-is-NOT deemed to place-the application in condition for allowance:
	The proposed amendment(s):
	will be entered upon filing of a Notice of Appeal and an Appeal Brief.
	will not be entered because:
	they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See note below).
	they raise the issue of new matter. (See note below).
	they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
	they present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.
	NOTE:
	Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s):
	Newly proposed or amended claims would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
į <b>Σ</b> !	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
X	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.
X	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition
X	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
<b>X</b>	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that
	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
	separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed: none
	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed: none  Claims objected to: none  Claims rejected: 1 and 5-9
□ <b>⊠</b>	The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed: none  Claims objected to: none  Claims rejected: 1 and 5-9
	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed: none  Claims objected to: none  Claims rejected: 1 and 5-9  The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).
□ <b>⊠</b>	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed: none  Claims objected to: none  Claims rejected: 1 and 5-9  The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).
	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed: none  Claims objected to: none  Claims rejected: 1 and 5-9  The proposed drawing correction filed on has has not been approved by the Examiner.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).  Other and not just thiosulfate as S-sensitizer. Tanemura et al. at 3:54-60 states that the
	Separate, timely filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.  The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  the references do not teach that sulfur sensitization requires the use of thiosulfate ion. Evans at 11:29 states that  S-sensitization may be used but at 21:20-23 states that any type of chemical sensitization may be used (cont'd)  The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.  For purposes of Appeal, the status of the claims is as follows (see attached written explanation, if any):  Claims allowed: none  Claims objected to: none  Claims rejected: 1 and 5-9  The proposed drawing correction filed on